

**PUBLIC NOTICE**  
**INTENT TO ADOPT A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION**  
**CITY OF SAN JOSÉ, CALIFORNIA**

**File No. GP03-01-02.** General Plan amendment to change the Land Use/Transportation Diagram designation for a 1.11-acre site located at the northwest corner of Arcadia Drive and Ardis Avenue from Medium Low Density Residential (8 DU/AC) to General Commercial. (Homara, Ocha, & Speno, Owners, Hooshang Homara, Developer). Council District: 1

California State Law requires the City of San José to conduct environmental review for all pending projects that require a public hearing. Environmental review examines the nature and extent of any potentially significant adverse effects on the environment that could occur if a project is approved and implemented. The Director of Planning, Building & Code Enforcement would require the preparation of an Environmental Impact Report if the review concluded that the proposed project could have a significant unavoidable effect on the environment. The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires this notice to disclose whether any listed toxic sites are present. The project location **does not** contain a listed toxic site.

Based on an initial study, the Director has concluded that the project described above will not have a significant effect on the environment. We have sent this notice to all owners and occupants of property within 500 feet of the proposed project to inform them of the Director's intent to adopt a Mitigated Negative Declaration for the proposed project on **October 20, 2003**, and to provide an opportunity for public comments on the draft Mitigated Negative Declaration. The public review period for this draft Mitigated Negative Declaration begins on **September 30, 2003** and ends on **October 20, 2003**.

A public hearing on the project described above is tentatively scheduled for **Planning Commission** on **November 17<sup>th</sup> & 19<sup>th</sup>, 2003 at 6:00 p.m.** and **City Council** on **December 2<sup>nd</sup> & 16<sup>th</sup>, 2003 at 7:00 p.m.** in the City of San Jose Council Chambers, 801 N. First Street, San Jose, CA 95110. The draft Mitigated Negative Declaration, initial study, and reference documents are available for review under the above file number from 9:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. Monday through Friday at the City of San Jose Department of Planning, Building & Code Enforcement, City Hall, 801 N. First Street, Room 400, San Jose, CA 95110. The documents are also available at the Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Main Library, 150 E. San Fernando Street, San Jose, CA 95112 and the West Valley Branch Library 1243 San Tomas Aquino Road, San José, CA 95117, and online at [www.ci.san-jose.ca.us/planning/sjplan/eir/mnd2003.htm](http://www.ci.san-jose.ca.us/planning/sjplan/eir/mnd2003.htm). Adoption of a Negative Declaration does not constitute approval of the proposed project. The decision to approve or deny the project described above will be made separately as required by City Ordinance. For additional information, please call **Lesley Xavier** at (408) 277-4576.

Stephen M. Haase, AICP  
Director, Planning, Building and Code Enforcement

Circulated on: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
Deputy

**DRAFT  
MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION**

The Director of Planning, Building and Code Enforcement has reviewed the proposed project described below to determine whether it could have a significant effect on the environment as a result of project completion. "Significant effect on the environment" means a substantial, or potentially substantial, adverse change in any of the physical conditions within the area affected by the project including land, air, water, minerals, flora, fauna, ambient noise, and objects of historic or aesthetic significance.

**NAME OF PROJECT:** Homara General Plan Amendment

**PROJECT FILE NUMBER:** GP03-01-02

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:** General Plan amendment to change the Land Use/Transportation Diagram designation for a 1.11-acre site from Medium Low Density Residential (8 DU/AC) to General Commercial.

**PROJECT LOCATION & ASSESSORS PARCEL NO.:** Northwest corner of Arcadia Drive and Ardis Avenue; APN: 303-33-020; -021; -022; -023; -024

**COUNCIL DISTRICT:** 1

**NAME OF APPLICANT:** Hooshang Homara

**MAILING ADDRESS AND PHONE NO. OF APPLICANT CONTACT PERSON:**  
3370 Stevens Creek Boulevard, San Jose, CA 95117  
(408) 309-8100

**FINDING**

The Director of Planning, Building & Code Enforcement finds the project described above will not have a significant effect on the environment in that the attached initial study identifies one or more potentially significant effects on the environment for which the project applicant, before public release of this draft Mitigated Negative Declaration, has made or agrees to make project revisions that clearly mitigate the effects to a less than significant level.

**MITIGATION MEASURES INCLUDED IN THE PROJECT TO REDUCE POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS TO A LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT LEVEL**

**AESTHETICS**

1. Urban Conservation Policy #2: The City should encourage new development which enhances the desirable qualities of the community and existing neighborhoods.

2. Urban Design Policy #1: The City should continue to apply strong architectural and site design controls on all types of development for the protection and development of neighborhood character and for the proper transition between areas with different types of land uses.
3. Urban Design Policy #8: Design solutions should be considered in the development review process which addresses security, aesthetics, and public safety.

#### GEOLOGY AND SOILS

4. Hazards Policy #1: Development should only be permitted in those areas where potential to the health, safety, and welfare of the residents of the community can be mitigated to an acceptable level.
5. Earthquake Policy #1: The City should require that all new buildings be designed and constructed to resist stresses produced by earthquakes.

#### LAND USE AND PLANNING

6. Commercial Policy #14: Existing commercial development within residential neighborhoods may expand when such development is small scale and is compatible with the adjacent residential neighborhood.
7. Urban Design Policy #6: Proposed structures adjacent to existing residential areas should be architecturally designed and sited to protect the privacy of the existing residences.
8. Urban Design Policy #22: Design guidelines adopted by the City Council should be followed in the design of development projects.

#### **PUBLIC REVIEW PERIOD**

Before 5:00 p.m. on **October 20, 2003**, any person may:

- (1) Review the Draft Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) as an informational document only; or
- (2) Submit written comments regarding the information, analysis, and mitigation measures in the Draft MND. Before the MND is adopted, Planning staff will prepare written responses to any comments, and revise the Draft MND, if necessary, to reflect any concerns raised during the public review period. All written comments will be included as part of the Final MND; or
- (3) File a formal written protest of the determination that the project would not have a significant effect on the environment. This formal protest must be filed in the Department of Planning, Building and Code Enforcement, 801 North First Street, San Jose, Room 400 and include a \$100 filing fee. The written protest should make a "fair argument" based on substantial evidence that the project will have one or more significant effects on the environment. If a valid written protest is filed with the Director of Planning, Building & Code Enforcement within the noticed public review period, the Director may (1) adopt the Mitigated Negative Declaration and set a noticed public hearing on the protest before

the Planning Commission, (2) require the project applicant to prepare an environmental impact report and refund the filing fee to the protestant, or (3) require the Draft MND to be revised and undergo additional noticed public review, and refund the filing fee to the protestan

Stephen M. Haase, AICP  
Director, Planning, Building and Code Enforcement

Circulated on: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
Deputy

Adopted on: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
Deputy

**INITIAL STUDY**

**PROJECT FILE NO.:** GP03-01-02

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:** General Plan amendment to change the Land Use/Transportation Diagram designation for a 1.11-acre site from Medium Low Density Residential (8 DU/AC) to General Commercial.

**PROJECT LOCATION:** Northwest corner of Arcadia Drive and Ardis Avenue. APN: 303-33-021; -022; -023; -024; -020

**GENERAL PLAN DESIGNATION:** Medium Low Density Residential (8 DU/AC)

**ZONING:** R-1-8 Single-Family Residence District

**SURROUNDING LAND USES:** Commercial car sales and single-family residential

**PROJECT APPLICANT'S NAME AND ADDRESS:** Hooshang Homara  
3370 Stevens Creek Boulevard,  
San Jose, CA 95117

**DETERMINATION**

**On the basis of this initial study:**

<input type="checkbox"/>	I find the proposed project could not have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because the project proponent has agreed to revise the project to avoid any significant effect. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
<input type="checkbox"/>	I find the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT (EIR) is required.
<input type="checkbox"/>	I find the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, but at least one effect has been (1) adequately analyzed in a previous document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and (2) addressed by mitigation measures based on the previous analysis as described in the attached initial study. An EIR is required that analyzes only the effects that were not adequately addressed in a previous document.
<input type="checkbox"/>	I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, no further environmental analysis is required because all potentially significant effects have been (1) adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (2) avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are included in the project, and further analysis is not required.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature

Name of Preparer: Lesley Xavier  
Phone No.: (408) 277-4576

**I. AESTHETICS - Would the project:**

<i>Issues</i>	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>	<i>Information Sources</i>
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,2
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock out-croppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,2
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1,2
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,2
e) Increase the amount of shade in public and private open space on adjacent sites?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,2

**FINDINGS:**

The proposed change in land use to General Commercial could alter the existing visual character of the subject site. The site is currently developed with 3 single-family homes and a parking lot for an adjacent commercial use. If the site were to be developed as commercial, a new building or parking could be built, which would change the visual character of the site.

**MITIGATION MEASURES:**

Implementing the following General Plan policies would mitigate the impact described above because the policies protect adjacent development against incompatible uses:

- Urban Conservation Policy #2: The City should encourage new development which enhances the desirable qualities of the community and existing neighborhoods.
- Urban Design Policy #1: The City should continue to apply strong architectural and site design controls on all types of development for the protection and development of neighborhood character and for the proper transition between areas with different types of land uses.
- Urban Design Policy #8: Design solutions should be considered in the development review process which addresses security, aesthetics, and public safety.

**II. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES - Would the project:**

<i>Issues</i>	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>	<i>Information Sources</i>
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,3,4
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,3,4
c) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,3,4

**FINDINGS:**

Any project developed on the site would be infill development. So, the proposed land use change to General Commercial will not impact agriculture resources.

**MITIGATION MEASURES:**

None required.

### III. AIR QUALITY - Would the project:

<i>Issues</i>	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>	<i>Information Sources</i>
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,14
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,14
c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is classified as non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions that exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,14
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,14
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,14

#### FINDINGS:

The proposed land use change to General Commercial is on an infill site and will not have an impact on air quality. The City of San Jose uses the threshold of significance established by the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) to assess air quality impacts. BAAQMD manages air quality issues and concerns in the Bay Area. Based on the threshold of significance, projects that are less than, or equal to, 87,000 square feet of retail space are not considered major air pollutant contributors. The potential retail square footage under the proposed land use designation is less than the established threshold of significance; therefore the change in land use will not have an impact on air quality.

#### MITIGATION MEASURES:

None required.

### BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES - Would the project:

<i>Issues</i>	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>	<i>Information Sources</i>
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,10
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any aquatic, wetland, or riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,6,10
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc., through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,6
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,10

<i>Issues</i>	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>	<i>Information Sources</i>
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,11
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional or state habitat conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,2

**FINDINGS:**

The change in land use to General Commercial uses on the developed site will not have an impact on biological resources. The site is currently developed with 3 single-family homes and a parking lot for an adjacent commercial use.

**MITIGATION MEASURES:**

None required.

**IV. CULTURAL RESOURCES - Would the project:**

<i>Issues</i>	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>	<i>Information Sources</i>
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines §15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,7
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines §15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,8
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site, or unique geologic feature?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,8
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,8

**FINDINGS:**

The subject site is not listed on the San Jose Historic Resources Inventory. The subject site is not located within an area of archeological sensitivity. In the event that an archeological resource is discovered during development of the property, conformance with the City's Historic, Archeological, and Cultural Resources Goals and policies would mitigate any potential impact to a less than significant level.

**MITIGATION MEASURES:**

None required.

**V. GEOLOGY AND SOILS - Would the project:**

<i>Issues</i>	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>	<i>Information Sources</i>
a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:					
1) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as described on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? (Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,5,24



<i>Issues</i>	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>	<i>Information Sources</i>
2) Strong seismic ground shaking?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1,5,24
3) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,5,24
4) Landslides?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,5,24
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,5,24
c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,5,24
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,5,24
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,5,24

**FINDINGS:**

The site is currently developed with 3 single-family homes and a parking lot for an adjacent commercial use all on a flat grade. Changing the land use on the site to General Commercial will not impact the geology and soils of the site. The closest known fault to the site is the Hayward Fault Line located approximately 10 miles northeast of the site. In the event that strong seismic ground shaking should occur, General Plan policies would mitigate the impact.

**MITIGATION MEASURES:**

Implementing the following General Plan policies would mitigate the impact described above:

- Hazards Policy #1: Development should only be permitted in those areas where potential to the health, safety, and welfare of the residents of the community can be mitigated to an acceptable level.
- Earthquake Policy #1: The City should require that all new buildings be designed and constructed to resist stresses produced by earthquakes.

**VI. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS - Would the project:**

<i>Issues</i>	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>	<i>Information Sources</i>
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,12
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,2

<i>Issues</i>	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>	<i>Information Sources</i>
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1
g) Impair implementation of, or physically interfere with, an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,2
h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1

**FINDINGS:**

The subject site is not listed on the California Environmental Protection Agency Hazardous Waste and Substances Sites List. The proposed change in land use to General Commercial will not create any hazards or hazardous materials.

**MITIGATION MEASURES:**

None required.

**VII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY - Would the project:**

<i>Issues</i>	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>	<i>Information Sources</i>
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,15
b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on-or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1
d) Result in increased erosion in its watershed?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1
e) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner that would result in flooding on-or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1
f) Substantially alter drainage patterns due to changes in runoff volumes and flow rates?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
g) Result in increased impervious surfaces and associated increased runoff as specified in the NPDES permit and the City's Post Construction Urban Runoff Management Policy?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
h) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,17
i) Result in an increase in pollutant discharges to receiving waters such as heavy metals, pathogens, petroleum derivatives, synthetic organics, sediment, nutrients, oxygen-demanding substances, and trash?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,17

<i>Issues</i>	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>	<i>Information Sources</i>
j) Result in an increase in any pollutant for which the water body is already impaired as listed on the Clean Water Act Section 303 (d) list available from the State Water Control Board?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
k) Result in alteration of receiving water quality during or following construction including clarity, temperature, and level of pollutants?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
l) Substantially alter surface water quality, or marine, fresh, or wetland waters as specified in the NPDES permit?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
m) Substantially alter ground water quality as specified in the NPDES permit?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
n) Cause or contribute to an exceedance of applicable surface or groundwater receiving water quality objectives or degradation of beneficial uses as specified in the NPDES Permit, General Plan, and City policy?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
o) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1
p) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a Federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,9
q) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures that would impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,9
r) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1
s) Be subject to inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1

**FINDINGS:**

The site is not subject to the one-percent flood. Future development of the site will be required to conform to the requirements of the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) to reduce impacts on storm water quality. A Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) may be required at the time of future development, in compliance with State regulations, to control the discharge of storm water pollutants.

**MITIGATION MEASURES:**

None required.

**VIII. LAND USE AND PLANNING - Would the project:**

<i>Issues</i>	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>	<i>Information Sources</i>
a) Physically divide an established community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,2
b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1,2
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,2

**FINDINGS:**

The proposed change in land use to the General Commercial land use designation is not inherently incompatible with any applicable City plans or policies. The subject site has an existing General Plan land use designation of Medium Low Density Residential (8 DU/AC). The proposed land use designation for the site is General Commercial. Some

General Commercial uses could be incompatible with the single-family residential uses to the south of the site. However, a commercial land use pattern already exists in the neighborhood. A similar change was made to the site located on the northeast corner of Arcadia Drive and Ardis Avenue adjacent to the site, in which, following design policies, the site used a landscaped area to buffer the commercial use from the single-family neighborhood. General Plan goals and policies would mitigate any impact created by a commercial land use to a less than significant level.

#### MITIGATION MEASURES:

- Commercial Policy #14: Existing commercial development within residential neighborhoods may expand when such development is small scale and is compatible with the adjacent residential neighborhood.
- Urban Design Policy #6: Proposed structures adjacent to existing residential areas should be architecturally designed and sited to protect the privacy of the existing residences.
- Urban Design Policy #22: Design guidelines adopted by the City Council should be followed in the design of development projects.

### IX. MINERAL RESOURCES - Would the project:

<i>Issues</i>	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>	<i>Information Sources</i>
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,2,23
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,2,23

#### FINDINGS:

A change in land use to General Commercial will not result in the loss of mineral resources. The proposed project is a change in the land use designation on the subject site, which is not a physical change to the site.

#### MITIGATION MEASURES:

None required.

### X. NOISE - Would the project result in:

<i>Issues</i>	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>	<i>Information Sources</i>
a) Exposure of persons to, or generation of, noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,2,13,18
b) Exposure of persons to, or generation of, excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1

<i>Issues</i>	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>	<i>Information Sources</i>
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1

**FINDINGS:**

A change in land use to General Commercial uses would not create a noise impact because future development on the site would be required to conform to the applicable San Jose 2020 General Plan noise policies.

**MITIGATION MEASURES:**

None required.

**XI. POPULATION AND HOUSING - Would the project:**

<i>Issues</i>	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>	<i>Information Sources</i>
a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,2
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1

**FINDINGS:**

The current land use designation on the subject property is Medium Low Density Residential (8 DU/AC). The proposed change of the subject site's land use designation to General Commercial will result in a loss of potentially 6 dwelling units. A decrease in density will not have a significant impact to population and housing.

**MITIGATION MEASURES:**

None required.

**XII. PUBLIC SERVICES - Would the project:**

<i>Issues</i>	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>	<i>Information Sources</i>
a) Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, the need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:					
Fire Protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,2
Police Protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,2
Schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,2
Parks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,2
Other Public Facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,2

**FINDINGS:**

Adequate municipal services are available to serve the site because it is located within an already urbanized area and any development on the site would be infill development.

**MITIGATION MEASURES:**

None required.

**XIII. RECREATION**

<i>Issues</i>	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>	<i>Information Sources</i>
a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,2
b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities that might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,2

**FINDINGS:**

Adequate recreational services are available to serve the site because it is located within an already urbanized area and any development on the site would be infill development.

**MITIGATION MEASURES:**

None required.

**XIV. TRANSPORTATION / TRAFFIC - Would the project:**

<i>Issues</i>	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>	<i>Information Sources</i>
a) Cause an increase in traffic, which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio of roads, or congestion at intersections)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,2,19
b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,2,19
c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,19
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible land uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,19
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,20
f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,18
g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,2,18

**FINDINGS:**

In the context of the San Jose 2020 General Plan horizon year, this project would have a less than significant traffic impact. The City of San Jose Department of Transportation analyzed the subject General Plan amendment and determined that the estimated number of new p.m. peak hour trips resulting from the proposed land use change is below the exemption threshold established for the area; therefore, the change in land use would not have a traffic impact. In addition, prior to development, this project will conform to all adopted City level of service and traffic policies in order to ensure adequate traffic capacity for existing and approved development.

**MITIGATION MEASURES:**

None required.

**XV. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS - Would the project:**

<i>Issues</i>	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>	<i>Information Sources</i>
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,15
b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,2,21
c) Require or result in the construction of new stormwater drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,17
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,22
e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,21
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,21
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,21

**FINDINGS:**

Adequate utilities and service systems are available to serve the site because it is located within an already urbanized area and any development on the site would be infill development.

**MITIGATION MEASURES:**

None required.

**XVI. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE**

<i>Issues</i>	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>	<i>Information Sources</i>
a) Does the project have the potential to (1) degrade the quality of the environment, (2) substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, (3) cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, (4) threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, (5) reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or (6) eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,10
b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? "Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects and the effects of other current projects.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1,16
c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1

**FINDINGS:**

The proposed project will not have a significant effect on the environment in terms of mandatory findings of significance in that the site does not contain any fish, wildlife, or endangered species and habitat. The site is located within an area of archeological sensitivity. Any development proposal on the site will be required to conform to the City's Urban Conservation, Urban Design, Hazards, Earthquake, and Commercial Goals and Policies. Conformance with the San Jose 2020 General Plan Policies will reduce the identified environmental impacts to a less than significant level.

**MITIGATION MEASURES:**

None required.



## CHECKLIST REFERENCES

1. Environmental Clearance Application – File No. GP03-01-02
2. San Jose 2020 General Plan
3. USDA, Soil Conservation Service, Soil Survey of SC County, August 1968
4. USDA, Soil Conservation Service, Important Farmlands of SC County map, June 1979
5. State of California's Geo-Hazard maps / Alquist Priolo Fault maps
6. Riparian Corridor Policy Study 1994
7. San Jose Historic Resources Inventory
8. City of San Jose Archeological Sensitivity Maps
9. FEMA Flood Insurance Rate Map, Santa Clara County, 1986
10. California Department of Fish & Game, California Natural Diversity Database, 2001
11. City of San Jose Heritage Tree Survey Report
12. California Environmental Protection Agency Hazardous Waste and Substances Sites List, 1998
13. City of San Jose Noise Exposure Map for the 2020 General Plan
14. BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines, Bay Area Air Quality Management District. April 1996, revised 1999.
15. San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board 1995 Basin Plan
16. Final Environmental Impact Report, City of San Jose, SJ 2020 General Plan
17. Santa Clara Valley Water District
18. City of San Jose Title 20 Zoning Ordinance
19. San Jose Department of Public Works
20. San Jose Fire Department
21. San Jose Environmental Services Department
22. San Jose Water Company, Great Oaks Water Company
23. California Division of Mines and Geology
24. Cooper Clark, San Jose Geotechnical Information Maps, July 1974